



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,401	12/08/2003	Sohail Baig Mohammed	MS1-1873US	2587
22801	7590	09/13/2007		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201				
			EXAMINER PRICE, NATHAN E	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/730,401

Applicant(s)

MOHAMMED ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan Price

Art Unit

2194

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David W. Foster.

(3) Nathan Price.

(2) Robert G. Hartman.

(4) William Thomson.

Date of Interview: 05 September 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sullivan.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed claim 1. Decided to have another interview on 12 September 2007 at 11 a.m. to further discuss claim 1 after further review of the cited art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

**FAX COVER SHEET**

TO	Examiner Price
COMPANY	United States PTO
FAX NUMBER	15712734196
FROM	Lee & Hayes Spokane Office
DATE	2007-08-30 18:13:00 GMT
RE	Proposed Interview Agenda - 10/730,401

**COVER MESSAGE**

Proposed Interview Agenda for Wednesday September 5th,  
2007 at 11am E.S.T.

Sincerely,  
David Foster  
(509) 324-9256 ex. 219

## 1 IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2 Application Serial No. ....10/730,401  
3 Filing Date ..... 12/08/2003  
4 Inventorship ..... Mohammed, Sohail Baig  
Applicant ..... Microsoft Corp.  
5 Group Art Unit ..... 2194  
Examiner ..... Price  
6 Attorney's Docket No. .... MS1-1873US  
Title: MEDIA PROCESSING METHODS, SYSTEMS AND APPLICATION  
PROGRAM INTERFACES

7 AGENDA FOR PROPOSED INTERVIEW8 \* \* FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY \* \*

9  
10 To: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
11 P.O. Box 1450  
12 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

13 From: David W. Foster (Tel. 509-324-9256 ext 219; Fax 509-323-8979)  
14 Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500  
15 Spokane, WA 99201  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2 **In the Claims**

3 1. (Original) A system comprising:

4 one or more computer-readable media;

5 an application program interface embodied on the one or more computer-  
6 readable media and which can be utilized to present a presentation;

7 the application program interface comprising:

8 a plurality of *open* methods that can be called by an application, the  
9 open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a destination for the  
10 presentation, and at least a parameter for specify a data source for the  
11 presentation; wherein collectively, the parameters for specifying a data  
12 source enable data sources to be specified in different manners;

13 a method for ascertaining the state of a media engine that causes the  
14 presentation to be presented;

15 a method for ascertaining capabilities of the media engine;

16 a method to start processing media samples that are the subject of  
17 the presentation;

18 a method to stop processing media samples; and

19 a method to pause media sample processing.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his Supervisory Patent Examiner for the courtesy of conducting an interview with Applicant's representatives, Robert G. Hartman and David W. Foster on Wednesday, September 5 at 11am E.S.T.

The following is an agenda requested by Examiner Price for a proposed interview. Applicant intends to discuss the differences between the claimed subject matter and the cited references. For exemplary purposes only, Applicant will discuss the agenda with regards to independent claim 1.

Applicant will respectfully submit that Sullivan has not been shown to disclose the methods recited in claim 1 for at least three reasons. First, Applicant will respectfully submit that claim 1 recites, in part, methods exposed through an Application Program Interface (API), whereas Sullivan at most has been shown to disclose exposing functionality through a Graphical User Interface. Second, Applicant will respectfully submit that claim 1 recites functionality entirely exposed through the API, whereas the cited portions of Sullivan requires custom, user-generated code to implement necessary aspects of the claimed functionality. Finally, Applicant will respectfully submit that the Office fails to show how Sullivan discloses a "plurality of *open* methods that can be called by an application, *the open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a destination for the presentation, and at least a parameter for specifying a data source for the presentation*". More generally, Applicant will respectfully submit that while Sullivan appears to describe a Java Media API, the scope of the API disclosed in Sullivan differs significantly from the API recited in claim 1.

1 In more detail, Applicant will first respectfully submit that the Office has not  
2 shown that Sullivan discloses “[an] application program interface comprising: ...  
3 a method to start processing media samples that are the subject of the presentation;  
4 a method to stop processing media samples; and a method to pause media sample  
5 processing.” Applicant will respectfully submit that while Sullivan appears to  
6 disclose a Java Media Player containing a graphical user interface enabled to  
7 start/stop/pause processing media samples (p. 34 ¶6). Sullivan, however, has not  
8 been shown to disclose an Application Program Interface comprising a method to  
9 start/stop/pause processing media samples.

10 Second, Applicant will respectfully submit that the Office has not shown  
11 that Sullivan discloses “the application program interface comprising: ... a method  
12 for ascertaining *capabilities of the media engine*.” While Sullivan (p. 56 ¶4)  
13 discloses a method of manually iterating through a list of controls and manually  
14 checking each iteration for compatibility with a desired interface, Sullivan has not  
15 been shown to disclose an API comprising a method for ascertaining capabilities  
16 of the media engine.

17 Additionally, Applicant will respectfully submit that the Office has not  
18 shown that Sullivan discloses “a plurality of *open* methods that can be called by an  
19 application, *the open methods comprising a parameter for specifying a*  
20 *destination for the presentation, and at least a parameter for specifying a data*  
21 *source for the presentation*”, as recited in Applicant’s claim. (emphasis added).  
22 Applicant will discuss that while Sullivan (p. 55 ¶2-4) appears to at most disclose  
23 displaying a Java Media Player(player.getVisualComponent()) and presenting the  
24 Java Media Player using an AWT layout manager (add(“Center”, compVisual)),  
25



1 Sullivan does not appear to disclose a single open method that can specify the  
2 destination of the presentation *and* specify a data source as recited in claim 1.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## Conclusion

Applicant greatly thanks the Office in advance for the courtesy of conducting an interview. Applicant notes that the following paper is submitted for discussion purposes only.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_

David W. Foster  
Reg. No. 60,902  
(509) 324-9256 ext 219